

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,006	01/17/2002	Valerie L. Crumley	IN-5421	9161
26922 7:	590 04/09/2004		EXAMINER	
BASF CORPORATION			GORR, RACHEL F	
ANNE GERRY 26701 TELEGI			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SOUTHFIELD	, MI 48034-2442		1711	
			DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments		10/052,006	CRUMLEY ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Rachel F. Gorr	1711			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	N⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 March 2004</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims	•				
4) 🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19 and 21-28</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) <u>20</u> is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	f.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
, -	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori					
	application from the International Bureau	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *				
* S	see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.			
Attachment						
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notice	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te			
3) 🔲 Inforn Paper	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1711

1. Claim 20 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The limitations of claim 20 are already in claim one.

Page 2

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-19 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNeil in view of Swarup (322).
- 4. McNeil discloses an aqueous coating composition comprising Bayhydrol 140 AQ (see example 4), the same polyurethane dispersion used in the applicant's examples; a dispersed anionic (col. 6, line 42) acrylic polymer having a glass transition temperature at least 20 deg. C higher than the polyurethane (col. 2, line 58) and an equivalent weight of 1000 or less (col. 6, line 37); a crosslinking component (top col. 6). He salts the dispersion with preferably dimethylethanolamine (col. 7, line 49), and he shows that the acrylic resin is made with a chain transfer agent (col. 8, line 9). Example 4 shows more than 50 wt. % of the sum of polyurethane, acrylic resin and crosslinker is pigment. He teaches that the composition is substantially solvent free (col. 9, line 24), and he shows applying clear topcoats over substrates coated with the above coating (bottom col. 10). In col. 8, lines 40-65, he shows that the polyurethane comprises at least 40 wt. % of the polyurethane plus the acrylic, and that the crosslinker comprises 2-30 wt. % of the polyurethane, acrylic and crosslinker. These amounts would overlap

Application/Control Number: 10/052,006

Art Unit: 1711

with the claim one limitation of 10-50 wt. % of polyurethane of the sum of urethane, acrylic and crosslinker. McNeil differs from the claims by not specifying flake pigments and the use of the coating as a base coating versus using it as a primer.

- 5. Swarup discloses base coatings comprising flake pigment (col. 11, line 41), polyurethanes, acrylic resins and an aminoplast crosllinker (see example VI).
- 6. It would have been obvious to use the coating of McNeil as a base coat with flake pigment because Swarup shows this for similar compositions. It would have been obvious to apply this base coat over the primer of McNeil because McNeil teaches that layers of coatings should be compatible (col. 2, line 27).
- 7. Applicant's arguments filed 3-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants argue that McNeil doesn't disclose flake pigment. The above rejection addresses this.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel F. Gorr whose telephone number is 571-272-1072. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Tues., Thurs., Fri., from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/052,006

Art Unit: 1711

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R.G. March 5, 2004

RACHEL GORR
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Rachel York